

REMARKS

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Official Action dated October 28, 2003. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 3-9, 11, 13, 16-17, and 20-24 are under consideration in this application. Claims 20-22 were reinstated by the Examiner. Claims 12, 15, 18-19 and 25 are being cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 7, 13, 15 and 25 are being amended, as set forth above and in the attached marked-up presentation of the claim amendments, in order to more particularly define and distinctly claim Applicants' invention.

Additional Amendments

The claims are being amended to correct formal errors and/or to better disclose or describe the features of the present invention as claimed. Applicants hereby submit that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

Formality Rejections

Claims 1, 7, 12-13 and 15 were rejected for some informalities, and claims 12-13 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for the recitation of "and a signal in the reverse phase thereto" in claim 12. As indicated, the claims have been amended as required by the Examiner or further clarified. In particular, the recitation of "and a signal in the reverse phase thereto" of claim 12 is absent from claim 13, which does not affect the allowability of claim 13. Accordingly, the withdrawal of the outstanding informality rejection is in order, and is therefore respectfully solicited.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1, 3-9, 11, 16-17 and 20-23 were allowed, and claim 13 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection.

As indicated, claim 13 is rewritten into independent form and to overcome 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection thus set in condition for allowance.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 12, 15 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by a newly cited reference U.S. Pat. No. 5,204,557 to Nguyen et al. (hereinafter "Nguyen"), and claims 18-19 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being rendered obvious by Nguyen.

As mentioned, claims 12, 15, 18-19, and 25 are being cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, the relevant rejections thus become moot. Claim 13 has been rewritten into independent form and to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection, and thus is in condition for allowance. Claim 24 is amended to depend from claim 13 thus set in condition for allowance.


In view of all the above, clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention as now claimed and the prior art reference upon which the rejections in the Office Action rely, Applicants respectfully contend that the prior art references cannot anticipate the present invention or render the present invention obvious. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the

above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the address and phone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley P. Fisher
Registration Number 24,344


Juan Carlos A. Marquez
Registration Number 34,072

REED SMITH LLP
3110 Fairview Park Drive
Suite 1400
Falls Church, Virginia 22042
(703) 641-4200

February 27, 2004

SPF/JCM/JT